

October 10, 1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21781

introduced these two great English-speaking nations to a period of one hundred and fifty years of permanent peace and mutual respect along an unfortified three-thousand-mile common boundary;

Whereas this struggle resulted in memorializing the principle of international peace by arbitration and disarmament and lasting peace among nations;

Whereas the enduring results of this conflict have cemented more strongly the cultural and economic ties which exist between Canada and the United States as a demonstration of peace and good will in a world today fraught with unrest and fear: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of thirteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(3) One representative of the Department of the Interior who shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) Four members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration, in 1963, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

Sec. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with agencies of State and local governments, with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within one year following the termination of the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$25,000.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 4, line 2, strike the period after "functions" and insert: "Provided, however, That no employee whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if said Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. Such rates of compensation may be adopted by the Commission as may be authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as of the same date such rates are authorized for positions subject to said Act. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee."

Amendment No. 2: On page 4, lines 10 and 11, strike the following: ", without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies."

Amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 15, strike the period after the word "resolution" and insert: "Provided, however, That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only."

Amendment No. 4: On page 5 at the end of Sec. 4, add the following new subsection: "(d) Mail matter sent by the Commission as penalty mail or franked mail shall be accepted for mail subject to section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, as amended."

Amendment No. 5: On page 5 strike the language on lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected for October 4, 1962. On page 21169 in the middle column, the first line of the fourth paragraph of my remarks in support of S. 1123 should read, "In addition, there are no regulations to" inserting the word "no". And in the third column, the first two lines of the second paragraph should read "To those children and employers removed from the exemption by this bill," changing the word "removal" to "removed".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WEST VIRGINIA

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions during the years 1959 and 1960, I took the floor to point out the way in which the State of West Virginia was being shortchanged in defense installations, military contracts, and other projects of the Federal Government. With the largest percentage of its population enlisted in the Korean conflict, and also the largest number of killed and wounded in proportion to population of any State in the Union, it could properly be stated that West Virginia was first in war, first in peace, and last in the hearts of the Pentagon.

West Virginia, which ranked 46th in the Nation—near the bottom of the heap—in per capita amount of military prime contracts in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, now ranks 30th in the Nation under President Kennedy. For the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to \$36,098,000, while the figures for the fiscal year 1962 showed \$133,782,000 for West Virginia. I have asked the Legislative Reference Service to prepare a ranking of the States on the per capita amount of military prime contracts. When these figures are related to population of each State, comparisons are more meaningful.

The Legislative Reference Service reports that \$19.51 per person was spent in West Virginia in the fiscal year 1960 in prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense. For the fiscal year 1962, this figure has rocketed to \$72.31—an increase of 370 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic illustration of the fact that West Virginia is no longer being shortchanged and that President Kennedy is fulfilling his campaign pledges to West Virginia.

AQUARIUM AND RESEARCH CENTER

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's RECORD you who voted for the aquarium and research center here in Washington will find an article that will be of much value to you when you go home. It is an article written by the smartest man in the country on fish, U.S. Senator BENJAMIN SMITH, of Massachusetts. He tells you how low we have fallen in research. We are fifth in the world in the matter of knowledge about fish. Peru is ahead of us with more boats and more knowledge. Red China, Japan, and Russia are ahead of us. We are fifth.

This article was published in the New York times last Sunday. Those who voted for the aquarium and research provision will find there the answer to most of the questions that can be asked on the subject. Take it home with you and you will know how low we have dropped in an industry that once brought us many millions of dollars. Now we are only fifth.

My advice to you before you leave here is to take a copy of today's Record with you. Then you can tell the people what a good job you have done for them.

CUBA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press that supersecret negotiations are going on in Havana, Cuba, to my amazement and shock between a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate, and Fidel Castro for the release of Cuban prisoners to result in turning \$60 million to Castro largely in foodstuffs—thus permitting Castro to overcome his food mistakes and the New Frontier to try to apologize for its Bay of Pigs mistakes.

I have sent a wire to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Comptroller General of the United States, asking the following questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so, let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Does not his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why has not a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

I add this following question:

According to the Department of State's reply to me by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary, March 10, 1962, when I asked for the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile he made, he said:

There are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison.

Why are not actions being taken to get American citizens out of prison in Cuba?

I include the entire letter of March 10 as a masterpiece of doubletalk, wishy-washy "accommodation" policies on Cuba following my wire yesterday to the President, Secretary of State, and the Comptroller General, protesting this effort to strengthen Castro and Cuba:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1962.
Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: The Department has been requested to reply to your telegram of February 3, 1962 to the President in which you expressed your concern over the plight of the Tampa cigar industry resulting from the embargo on trade with Cuba and in which you urged that additional steps be

undertaken designed to effect the downfall of the Castro regime.

You may be assured that in recommending that an embargo be imposed upon trade with Cuba, the Department carefully considered the impact this measure might have upon the domestic tobacco industry. In the light of the decisions taken at the recent meeting of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este with respect to the Communist Castro threat to the hemisphere and considering that the Communist Cuban Government was continuing to earn dollars through sales of its products in the United States, it was determined that such an embargo would be both timely and in the overall national interest. The Department is confident that the patriotic citizens of the Tampa area comprehend the desirability of depriving the Communist regime of Cuba of badly needed dollar income.

The Department appreciates receiving suggestions which may advance our policy with respect to Cuba. Your recommendations have been particularly welcome and the courses of action you advocate have received and will continue to receive most careful consideration based upon our national interests, including our international obligations and commitments.

The Department is pleased to take this opportunity to comment on the various proposals you have made.

RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT OF A CUBAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

The recognition of a Government of Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the United States because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent U.S. interests before the Castro regime. Were a government-in-exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations. In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

PREVENTION OF THE SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIAL BY THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC TO CUBA

Underlying an announcement, such as you suggest, that the United States will not permit the shipment of war materiel to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet bloc is, of course, the intention to insure that the terms of the announcement are fulfilled. Effective prevention of these shipments may entail interference with shipping on the high seas, expose the United States and its allies to reciprocal treatment, and thus exacerbate the already tense international situation. You may be assured, however, that close attention is being paid to the military buildup in Cuba, with special reference to the growing Cuban potential for intervention and subversion in Latin America.

PAYROLL AT GUANTÁNAMO BASE

The Department of the Navy has informed the Department of State that the Cuban nationals employed at the base are for the most part skilled workers who have given long and faithful service to the United States. Most of them have U.S. civil service status and represent families who have worked for the naval base for several generations. Like other employees of the base, they are paid in U.S. currency.

When consideration was given to paying these employees in Cuban pesos in order to avoid supplying the Communist Cuban Government with foreign exchange, it was determined that this plan would not benefit the United States. The peso introduced by the Castro regime in August 1961 has been

rejected by free world traders as a medium of international exchange, and Cuban pesos are unobtainable outside Cuba. Therefore, in order to obtain pesos to pay the Cuban employees of the base, Guantánamo officials would have to purchase pesos from the National Bank of Cuba for the whole amount of the base payroll for Cuban nationals at the official exchange rate set by the Cuban Government at 1 peso for 1 dollar. Since approximately 1,100 of the 3,150 Cuban nationals employed at the base now reside on the base, only a small portion of the dollar wages presently paid that group returns to the Cuban economy. Thus, fewer dollars are supplied the Castro regime under the present payment procedure than would be the case under the alternative of payment in Cuban currency.

AID TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

As you know, the Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program of mutual cooperation among the American Republics, from which Cuba has been excluded. The contribution of effort and resources which the Latin American Republics are expected to make will outweigh by far the contribution of capital which they will receive from the United States and other sources. A number of the Latin American countries are confronted with serious domestic political problems which stem in part from the inroads made by Castro-Communists and other extremist elements. To contain and overcome such threats to their stability, the governments of these nations require our aid to improve the political, economic, and social climate in their respective countries so that orderly progress may be made within a democratic framework. To withhold our assistance would in many instances further weaken the very nations that for the above-mentioned reasons find that it is politically unfeasible at this time to undertake steps, such as sanctions, against the Communist Cuban Government.

AID TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The United States extends assistance to two Communist countries, Poland and Yugoslavia. However, this aid is in no way channeled to Cuba or to any third country. The recent press report that one of the Yugoslav freighters carrying jet aircraft purchased in the United States stopped at Havana for 6 days "under a complete blackout" is unfounded. Reliable and verified information available to this Government indicates conclusively that none of the Yugoslav ships carrying these planes touched Cuba. In this connection I am enclosing for convenient reference a copy of Secretary Rusk's statement before the Select Committee on Export Control of the House of Representatives.

The Department sympathizes with the plight of the cigar industry employees at Tampa. At the Department's request, the Department of Labor has provided the following information with respect to the impact of the embargo in that area and the steps that have been taken to date by that Department:

Immediately upon announcement of the ban on Cuban imports the Secretary of Labor dispatched a representative of the U.S. Employment Service to Tampa to investigate the effects on employment of the embargo on Cuban tobacco. The area's labor force amounts to about 280,000 with about 3,800 engaged in the tobacco industry in Tampa. Local estimates indicate the supply of tobacco on hand is adequate for another 6 to 12 months of normal operations. This has been substantiated by Mr. James Corral, president of the Cigar Manufacturers Association.

As you may know, there is a special provision in the Florida Unemployment Insur-

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21783

ance law which provides for a uniform benefit year beginning in May for cigarworkers in Hillsborough County (Tampa). This preserves and makes usable workers' wage credits prior to their layoff for a longer period of time.

Only three plants in the area use 100 percent Habana tobacco. The Secretary of Labor is keeping currently informed on the developments in this area and has taken steps to gather pertinent information to determine the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the activity of the local public employment office in developing job opportunities for those individuals who may be affected by this action. Public employment officials in the Tampa area are also working with State and local government officials to develop plans to maintain employment stability in the industry and to provide job opportunities for unemployed workers.

Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding \$60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners, which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the \$62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for and authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro and having introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the \$62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States through a private citizen and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business (trade) with Castro and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the \$60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of \$60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world in the future. I am asking that this supersecret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen, namely Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy govern-

ment on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the inshipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. These basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated in my opinion in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

THE \$10 MILLION FISH BOWL

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to justify the \$10 million glorified fish bowl in Washington, D.C., as a research center intrigues me and I might add it would be humorous if \$10 million was not involved.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of the millions upon millions of dollars that are already being spent for research with respect to fish. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], recently obtained from the Department of the Interior a statement showing that some 79 projects are now being conducted in research on salmon alone. There are scores of others dealing with other species.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier now is; Ask not what the fish can do for you, but rather what you can do for the fish.

ASSOCIATION OF GREEK SHIPOWNERS HONORS RECOMMENDATION TO HALT SHIPPING TO CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, word has just come that the Association of Greek Shipowners has decided to honor the recommendations of the Greek Government and halt shipping to Cuba. This decision stands as a signal victory in the current Cuban crisis.

In a firm and decisive statement, the Greek shipping association recommended "emphatically to its members that they abstain from all types of charter contracts for the transportation of goods to and from Cuba despite the repercussions this will have on Greek shipping in these difficult times."

Thus Greece joins the ranks of our most cooperative allies. Those other nations honoring U.S. requests for boycotting Cuba are West Germany, Turkey, and the Norwegian shippers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and immediate means of combatting communism in this hemisphere is to halt free world shipping to the island of Cuba. This would force the entire burden on the already strained Communist fleet, crimp the Cuban Communist pipeline, and make communism in this hemisphere untenable and impractical to support.

We salute our West German, Turkish, Norwegian, and Greek friends. But what of our friends the British?

(Mr. HAGAN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. HAGAN of Georgia's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CHARITABLE SOLICITATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. DOWDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the matter about which I shall speak has nothing to do with foreign affairs. However, a few days ago there was an article which appeared in the local press relating to the fact that under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act permission had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable contributions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the Superintendent of Licenses and Permits said that his office had no authority to deny a solicitation permit under the law to these people.

Mr. Speaker, the acts of these people are banned under the laws of God, the laws of nature, and they are against the laws of man. I think a situation which requires them to be permitted a license to solicit charitable funds for the promotion of their deviations is a bad law.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to correct this situation. I trust that by the beginning of next year we will have sufficient reports from the various departments to effectively prevent this sort of action.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kentucky has been proud of many of its Representatives in Washington, including some of the country's greatest. Today we are facing the loss of our senior Congressman by voluntary retirement, to a rest which he has well earned by 32 years of service—including almost 16 years as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

During that period of service, BRENT SPENCE has been the guiding hand in the development of legislation for housing programs that will remain a monument to his memory long after all of us have passed from this scene.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, had become an institution in Kentucky. The only campaign he had to make was to file an application to have his name placed on the ballot and his reelection was assured. The people of Kentucky and especially northern Kentucky both loved and respected BRENT SPENCE.

Entering Congress 2 years before the beginning of the Roosevelt administration at an age when many of us are considering retirement, he became a staunch supporter of the fiscal and financial reforms sponsored by our great depression President and advanced to the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee before the end of that long administration.

While his law practice began in the 19th century, he was one of those gifted individuals who was always able to look to the future, to lay the groundwork for the proper development of the America that few of us will see in the 21st century. Now, as the oldest Member of Congress, he can step aside for a well deserved rest without regrets because we are all sure that his job was well done.

His record here stamps him as one of the greatest of Kentucky's Congressmen, which includes such illustrious names as Henry Clay, Alben Barkley, Fred Vinson, and others too numerous to mention.

His splendid example remains as an inspiration to all of us.

GRANTING EASEMENTS ON REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 4 and insert:

"(d) The term 'real property of the United States' excludes the public lands (including minerals, vegetative, and other resources) in the United States, including lands reserved

or dedicated for national forest purposes, lands administered or supervised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, Indian-owned trust and restricted lands, and lands acquired by the United States primarily for fish and wildlife conservation purposes and administered by the Secretary of the Interior, lands withdrawn from the public domain primarily under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and lands acquired for national forest purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was voted out of our committee unanimously. The Senate amendment is acceptable to the minority. It also takes out of the bill what little controversy there was concerning it. I ask the gentleman, is that not correct?

Mr. McFALL. That is correct; the gentleman has stated the fact. The bill would grant authority to the heads of the executive agencies having control over real property of the United States to grant easements for rights-of-way purposes. I believe it was passed on the Consent Calendar in the House. A public lands amendment was taken from the bill as it passed the House. The Senate has included the amendment which excludes public lands, the way the bill was originally introduced. I know of no opposition to or criticism of the bill as it stands now.

MORE ON \$60 MILLION TO CASTRO FOR PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I intend not to object—because of the limitation of the 1-minute rule earlier, I did not have the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I will say that it appears to me that if we are asking other nations to cut off trade with Cuba, we should set the example first and not negotiate directly or indirectly or permit negotiations by a private citizen to send \$60 million worth of foodstuffs to Cuba at the same time. I strongly oppose such action, I cannot understand this double-standard, this conciliatory attitude towards Cuba and I intend to discuss the matter in detail on my special order later today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11880) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can advise the House whether the amendments of the Senate to the Foreign Service Buildings Act are germane to the legislation as it passed the House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not. As the gentleman knows, the Senate has added two bills as amendments; the equal pay bill and the bill providing for an additional Secretary of State.

Mr. BOW. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. Speaker, my objection was made with some regrets for I favor the bill as it applies to Foreign Service buildings. Furthermore, I favor the equal pay bill that was added as a Senate amendment, and I voted for that bill when it was considered as a separate measure in the House. While I am opposed to the additional Assistant Secretary of State that would be added by another Senate amendment, that is not the reason for my objection to considering this bill as it was returned from the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit the consideration of amendments that are not germane to the measure being acted upon except by unanimous consent or, under certain circumstances, by a majority of two-thirds of the Members voting; and with one other important exception, that, under our rules, no point of order can be made against a Senate amendment regardless of how flagrantly it violates the rule of germaneness, nor is it necessary to have more than a simple majority to adopt such an amendment. This rule must be based on an overly generous application of the so-called rule of comity for it certainly is not in keeping with the other rules concerning germaneness.

The two Senate amendments to this Foreign Service buildings bill are not germane by any stretch of the imagination. I do not question the motivation behind these amendments, but regardless of the motivation I am strongly of the opinion that this is not the way this House should legislate. This measure is now a conglomerate of three bills no one of which is germane to either of the other two. I would have absolutely no objection to the consideration of each of them individually, and I would vote in favor of the passage of two as I have already indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House rules, with regard to the consideration of Senate amendments that are not germane, are not logical or reasonable. At the beginning of the 88th Congress I intend to offer an amendment to the rules which will require that consideration of ungermane Senate amendments be only by unanimous consent or by a two-thirds majority vote as is required if such amendments originate in our own House. In the meantime I feel constrained to use such parliamentary means as are available to prevent amendments, such as those to H.R. 11880, coming before the House.

were prepared to do so in part last year until the West Germans leaked our plans to the press—then we stand to lose West Germany. If this occurs, NATO would be disbanded, and Western Europe would be ripe for neutralization and subsequent communization.

The United States must seize the initiative in Berlin while Mr. Khrushchev has given us the moratorium to settle our election problems. We could start by making some demands of our own. First, we could demand that the people in East Germany be given free elections, as they were originally promised. Next, we could demand that the wall be removed. Next, we could demand that Korea, Vietnam, and Germany be reunited through free elections. Next, we could demand that the Soviets get out of Cuba, in accord with the Monroe Doctrine. If Mr. Khrushchev refuses, then why couldn't we rattle a few rockets in his face to force him to at least trade with us on a quid pro quo basis, rather than permitting all the trading to be against our interests. I do not advocate any deals with the Communists, because they have proved they will honor their commitments only so long as they are in their own interests. But, since our State Department insists on negotiations, we ought to have some demands of our own to make.

If we act with determination, and proceed without delay in making demands and taking actions on Cuba, we can create a crisis that will put Mr. Khrushchev on the griddle while Berlin simmers on the back burner. After all, he knows which side has superior military power. Why not convince him we have the will to use that power?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I firmly believe that this resolution expresses the opinion of the average American citizen. It has become a truism to state that the conduct of foreign policy resides in the executive branch of our Government. I know of no one who would take issue with this statement. However, upon a more careful evaluation of this constitutional responsibility, one realizes that the executive branch is charged only with the implementation and conduct of foreign policy. The power to formulate foreign policy still resides in the electorate—the people of the United States. The best way that the people of the United States have for making their will and their firm resolve known to the President and to the State Department is through their most closely responsible elected officials, those of us in the Congress. This resolution which expresses the will of the people of the United States is no more and no less than a directive from the people to the executive branch of the Government specifying the framework within which our foreign policy on Berlin must be conducted.

It must be noted that this resolution is not self-executing. Commendable as it may be, unless it is honored by our President and the State Department there is no particular virtue in the Congress giving its unanimous approval to it.

Not only do I urge its speedy approval, but I implore those officials charged with the implementation of the policy which it expresses to take heed and honor it as a solemn obligation owed to the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senator Concurrent Resolution 97 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be

printed in the RECORD the full text of the concurrent resolution and portions of the report on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The report of the Foreign Relations Committee is very brief, and it should appear in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and the report (No. 2288) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 570

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and

Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination;

(b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;

(c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

SENATE REPORT NO. 2288

The Committee on Foreign Relations having had under consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, reports the resolution favorably, with an amendment, and recommends that the resolution as amended be passed.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 was introduced on October 3, 1962, by Mr. JAVITS for himself and Mr. MORSE. On October 5, 1962, the House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 570, which was identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 with the exception of one word. The Senate resolution had expressed the sense of Congress that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral purpose. The House substituted for the word "purpose" the word "determination".

On October 10, the Committee on Foreign Relations met in executive session and gave consideration to the two resolutions pending before it. Without objection it was agreed to amend Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 to conform to the resolution passed by the House of Representatives and to report Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, as thus amended, to the Senate.

The committee believes that the resolution clearly and succinctly states the determination of the Congress and of the American

people with respect to the determination of the United States to fulfill our commitments with respect to the freedom of the people of Berlin. This commitment is expressed in paragraph (c) in these words: "That the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom."

The committee recommends early and unanimous approval of this resolution by the Senate.

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I find both encouragement and disappointment in the announcement that the administration has decided to take unilateral steps to prevent transportation of supplies to Cuba in ships owned by nations who are our allies or profess neutrality. That we were forced to go it alone after making what I understand were strong representations to our allies is a bitter pill to swallow. That we have moved so promptly, although clearly not as far as we might have, encourages those of us who sincerely believe that stronger and more positive action was required.

We have taken a step, a good first step, but there is much yet to be done and there should be other steps, bigger ones. Surely we must have a showdown in the Caribbean and we must prepare for that day.

For one thing, Russia will be forced to increase the number of its own ships that will ply back and forth, to and from Cuba. The planned construction of a fishing port in Cuba by the Soviets shows their design to move into the Western Hemisphere for keeps. So while we have taken a good first step it can only be the start of more drastic, far-reaching action if we are successfully to thwart the Soviets in their move into the Western Hemisphere. In recent weeks, there have been a variety of proposals to meet the threat presented by Cuba, and the intervention of the Soviets. In spite of widely divergent proposals, all informed persons recognize the potential peril in the growing military buildup in Cuba with Russian assistance.

It appears inevitable that sooner or later we will find ourselves in a position which demands action for the protection of our own national security and for the protection of our friendly neighbors. President Kennedy has made it clear that on the basis of the present conditions and circumstances we do not regard the Cuban situation as requiring an invasion. Nevertheless, Castro keeps shouting to the world that we are plotting an invasion.

So the Communist-supported Cuban military buildup grows and grows—Castro's military capability increases by leaps and bounds—and all the while Castro protests his fear of military attack and seeks to brand us as the aggressor.

The entire world knows that we are not the aggressor in this situation. We did not create this powder keg in the Caribbean area. However, the time has come when we should and must act in

self-protection and in the defense of our own national security. The threat to us may be more indirect than direct, but it is nevertheless real and imminent. How far must we retreat before invoking positive measures necessary for our own defense?

The answer is clear. The longer we wait, the greater becomes Castro's military power and potential for harm; and the greater the efforts we must exert in our own defense.

These conclusions respecting the Cuban peril crystallize the serious study I have given the question for many months. Even before November 1961, when I visited our naval base at Guantanamo, the real danger was becoming apparent. And, of course, since that time our fears and suspicions have been confirmed.

It is heartening to know that we have a wonderful group of top fighting men at Guantanamo, all of them imbued with great spirit, from their chief, Rear Adm. Edward H. O'Donnell, on down.

A year ago I visited Guantanamo and spent some time with Admiral O'Donnell. I was very favorably impressed with him as a naval officer as well as with his fine concept of the real peril now involved and the future peril.

As chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, I have done a great deal of work and have gained a great deal of information on the situation that cannot be brought out into the open. I do not know more about it than others, of course, and I do not know as much as many persons do, but I mention this to show that it was a long, painstaking study, and the very opposite of a hasty conclusion. It is my deliberate conclusion, after all hope has been exhausted, that nothing short of what I propose will do the work. Also, I am convinced that if we do not take more drastic steps, we shall increase the peril and get further into the woods.

I propose, Mr. President, that we create and define a defensive area or zone around Cuba which we consider vital to our own national security. And, further, that we give notice to all the world that, within this defensive zone or area, we are fully prepared to take whatever action necessary to protect our Nation and our Latin American allies from any further buildup of military strength and striking power which might endanger our security.

At the same time, we must demonstrate to and reassure the Cuban people that it is not they, but their Communist masters, who are the object of these preparations. Our humanitarian aid in the form of necessary food and medicine could and would nevertheless go through to the Cuban people.

This would be an act of defense, not an act of aggression. It would differ little from the action we took in stationing our 7th Fleet in the Formosa Straits and in announcing to the world our intention to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That action could not be characterized as other than a defensive measure on behalf of an ally and in our own interest—a defensive measure which unquestionably deterred any in-

tent to invade which the Red Chinese might have entertained.

We have taken similar defensive steps in Lebanon in 1958, in Turkey, in Greece, in Western Europe, and elsewhere around the globe.

If we were right as to Formosa, Lebanon, and elsewhere, what then should stand in the way of adopting identical steps for our own protection in the Caribbean—our own backyard? Why should we fear any loud cries of "blockade," if we are taking appropriate steps for our own protection? A blockade is not a blockade when a nation acts prudently in its own interest and in self-defense, choosing not to wait until it is too late.

Day by day the peril grows as Khrushchev and Castro take step after step to pave the way for that Russian foothold. Recently, we were advised that the Soviets were undertaking the construction of a fishing port in Cuba in order to facilitate the commercial fishing operations of the Russian fleet in the Western Hemisphere. Coupled with this was the announcement that Cuba and Russia together are building 62 trawlers for Castro's use. We would be naive indeed to accept these announcements at face value and to conclude that peaceful uses alone are considered for the fishing port and the ships.

It took a long time in the history of affairs for it to be discovered that the area at Cuba was such a valuable fishing port for these faraway interests and countries.

One of the reasons recently assigned for the conclusion that Castro's military buildup was defensive was the fact that he had no ships with which to mount an invasion. Now we are told he is getting 62 ships. Trawlers can be used for fishing. They can also transport soldiers, and they can be mounted with guns. We might refer to these ships as Castro convertibles. And the fishing port provides a convenient submarine base in the Western Hemisphere.

The history of 20th century aggression is a long line of probing steps taken by an aggressor who felt his way—going as far as he could, ready at the same time to withdraw in the face of firm resistance. So it with Mussolini in Ethiopia in 1935, with Hitler in the demilitarized Rhineland in 1936, with the Red Chinese in Formosa in 1950 and later, and with the Soviets in Berlin in 1948 and 1961. And so it is the same, I believe, in 1962, with Khrushchev seeking a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

When the Berlin resolution was considered, I really expected that there would be some debate on it and some explanation. I was not prepared to debate it. I certainly did not intend to oppose it. However, it seems to me, relatively speaking, that our position is already well known as to Berlin. We have had troubles in Western Germany all through the years. We have troubles in Berlin now. We have repeatedly said—and have acted to back up our statements—that they shall not pass, that we are not going to yield.

At the same time, Mr. President, it seems clear to me that with reference to Cuba, which can be a point of peril, such

a short distance from our shoreline, it is absolutely necessary to take more positive steps and more firm action, somewhat along the line I have suggested. Otherwise, month after month and year after year this peril will become greater. It will grow in strength. It will grow in activity. It will become more and more difficult and burdensome for us to overcome.

My suggestion is only one suggestion. I believe every Member of the Senate who believes that some positive action is necessary should come forward and make a suggestion, after his thought has matured and a definite conclusion has been reached on the subject. This is my soul-searching conclusion, based upon at least a fair connection with and knowledge of the facts, from discussions not only with my fellow Senators, but also with many well-informed people who are in a position to know the facts, people who carry responsibility. Some of them have great military knowledge and experience.

I am speaking solely for myself on this subject.

The perimeter area around Cuba which we must defend for our own self-protection and preservation is a matter for our military people to decide. Whatever this area be, we must take immediate steps to define its boundaries and announce our determination in clear and unmistakable terms.

Both our Western allies and our friends in this hemisphere will certainly understand the necessity of our action.

I am not versed in the field of diplomacy. I know nothing about diplomatic talk. However, logic, commonsense, and down-to-earth consideration of these matters, I repeat with emphasis, leads me to the conclusion that I do not see how in the world our Western allies or our friends in this hemisphere could fail to understand the absolute necessity for our action.

First, we must clearly formulate our plans to protect our shores and our interests, and then announce and declare these plans to our Western and Latin American Allies sufficiently in advance for them to make the necessary and appropriate preparations and adjustments.

Our recent moves to bar aid to Cuba through a strangulation of the sea routes provide a substantial first step in the desired direction, including, first, the exclusion from U.S. ports of foreign ships transporting arms and other supplies to Cuba; second, the prohibition of any trade with Cuba for U.S. ships sailing under foreign registry, along with the similar prohibition for U.S. ships under domestic registry.

These steps gave notice to our allies that we were displeased with their failure to assist us voluntarily in freezing out the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere via Cuba. Some of them—West Germany, Greece, Italy—heard our call. But others called it our own local problem, as if Berlin were the common problem for all the Western Allies while Cuba was our own private problem.

There are certain risks in following this course. But I say that the risks

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21739

from inaction, from watching and waiting, are greater. Sooner or later we will be faced with an even more grave crisis in the Caribbean.

An effective plan for our own defense in the Caribbean will entail less cost and effort now than will be required when Castro has built up maximum strength with the aid of the Kremlin.

Back to Khrushchev's most recent step—the building of a port allegedly for the benefit of Russian fishing vessels. Close as Cuba is to our shore, including for example our missile testing base at Cape Canaveral, obviously any more moves of this sort holds in it the seeds of trouble for the United States.

Of course, the Panama Canal is not too far away.

That Castro's growing and cumulative military power is not immediately aided by this fishing port does not lessen the reality of his potential strength, nor does it lessen the continuing buildup serving as still another act of defiance to the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere.

Further, if we stand aside to allow Cuba's military preparations to continue without halt of substantial impediment, this will serve only as an encouragement for communistic probing and exploration at other trouble spots, Berlin or Formosa, for example.

Finally as our Latin American neighbors see Cuba in the ferment of unimpeded military preparation, they may well believe it the better part of valor to align themselves with Cuba. An unmistakable show of determination by the United States is necessary to counter these grave possibilities.

I say again, for emphasis, that this is my thought. This is my suggestion. This is a step which I think we should take in due course, after proper notice, as I have said, which would render unnecessary later the taking of far graver or more far-reaching steps of a similar or even more burdensome kind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who is well versed on this and kindred subjects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I desire to say a word with reference to one comment that the very able Senator from Mississippi made about there being no debate on the Berlin concurrent resolution. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was brought before the Senate by unanimous consent. Unanimous consent was necessary, because the concurrent resolution was reported only today. One of the chief sponsors of the concurrent resolution in the Senate was the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I asked the Senator from Oregon if he cared to make a statement. He said he did not. I made a very brief statement merely explaining what our action had been. I think it was generally felt that there was no need for debate. No Senator seemed to want to debate the resolution. However, complying perhaps with the implied suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi, I wish to say—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that I am glad to have the Senator make his comments. His comments will be helpful for the RECORD. I was not opposing the resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that fully.

I agree with the Senator when he states that our commitments in Berlin have been stated over and over again. Some people may think that it is futile or useless to state our position again in the form in which it has now been stated. On the other hand, numerous Members of Congress of both Houses felt that it would be a good thing for the Congress to make a statement now in a concurrent resolution as to the sense of Congress.

In all frankness, I have never looked with a great deal of favor upon such resolutions. When the resolution relating to Formosa was before the Senate in 1953, I said on the floor of the Senate that the resolution was unnecessary. I stated that we had a treaty with Formosa that obligated us to do the things stated. It is within the discretion of the President to determine how such obligations are carried out.

Mr. STENNIS. I remember the argument of the Senator from Alabama on that very point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the Near East resolution came before the Senate, I took exactly the same attitude. Back in 1947, when the Greek-Turkish problem arose, the President of the United States did not call upon Congress for a resolution. He came to Congress with a message and said, "This is the foreign policy of the United States."

So far as I am concerned, the policy that was stated at that time by President Truman in relation to the Greek-Turkish problem is still the foreign policy of the United States. I felt that President Eisenhower would certainly be well within his rights in acting under that policy and making the same pronouncement.

I have somewhat the same feeling with reference to Cuba. I realize that Cuba is closer to home and that the problem is highly emotional. However, I voted for the Formosa resolution, the Near East resolution, and the Cuban resolution.

I had the same feeling about Berlin. First, as is stated in the preamble of our resolution, we have a responsibility under the Four Power Pact signed at the end of the war. Furthermore, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy have all pledged to the people of Berlin that we will do whatever is necessary in order to preserve the integrity of Berlin and the freedom of the people of Berlin. Of course, we will stand by that commitment.

However, someone is always ready to say that we will not stand fast in Berlin. The Senator has heard that statement. He has seen it in newspapers and has read it in columns in different places around the country. Perhaps it would be a good thing for Congress to restate its position that we are going to stand firm.

I am as confident as I can be that the President of the United States, with or without the resolution, is determined to carry out our commitments to the people of Berlin and, furthermore, to the people in the Government of West Germany and to our allies in NATO and Western Europe.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think it is very reassuring for the Senator to make a strong statement of that kind as to his belief. He represents the belief of all of us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi knows that the Senator's remarks will strengthen the RECORD and the resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, I should like to move into a discussion of the Cuban situation very briefly.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Cuban situation is naturally rather emotional because it is so close to home. Cuba is a part of our Western Hemisphere. It is a country which we liberated from a European power, and a country to which we gave much down through the years. It stings us to think of the present situation.

I have given a great deal of thought and attention to the Cuban situation. I have received a great amount of mail from my constituents and from others in different parts of the country regarding Cuba. I have tried to study the subject as best I could. I have attended conferences at the White House, and in the State Department. Secretary Rusk has appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member. Representatives of the CIA have appeared before the committee. Secretary of Defense McNamara has been before the committee. There have been conferences with other military powers.

I wish to state a very few conclusions which I have reached.

First, I desire to make clear that I believe we have reliable sources of information on Cuba.

Second, I believe that the military has made very careful calculations on the military situation, strength, type, and so forth.

Third, I believe that there is a strong probability of obtaining unanimity of action on the part of the Western Hemisphere. Goodness knows, we need it. A great many of the people in Latin America still think of the Gringos of the imperial north. When they think of intervention, they think of gunboat diplomacy. I do not lose patience with our Government when it tries to overcome those difficulties.

I think headway is being made to overcome them. The conference held in Washington only a week ago made considerable headway. I believe there will be unanimity of action. Steps have been taken.

I noticed the Senator's careful statement that steps should be taken in due course. I am glad he used the term "in

21740

due course," because I think, as the Good Book says, there is a time for all things.

One of the great mistakes we might make would be to do what some in our country—and not the Senator from Mississippi—have advocated, which is to rush in headlong and do something rash. As long as we can close the vise on the Castro regime, we will make headway.

I could relate a great many more of my thoughts regarding Russia's connections with Cuba and what she is going to be willing, able, and ready to do. But I believe the Cuban situation can be handled. It is being handled. The President has correct information as to what the situation is there. He is on the alert as to what needs to be done. I believe that those things are being done, to use the Senator's words, in due course.

There is one other thing that some of our people seem to overlook, that is the fact that while Cuba is close to home, it must not be considered as an isolated situation. There are many such bad spots throughout the world. We know from past performance that the Kremlin is able to press the button and produce trouble in any one of many spots around the world. I believe that Khrushchev clearly planned from the beginning to use Cuba as an irritant to the United States and still intends to do so. Nothing would please him more than to have us become so involved in Cuba that we might become indifferent with respect to Berlin.

Berlin is the great danger spot in the world. That is where world war III could break out. I believe that our Government is working on this problem diligently, and at the same time is keeping in mind the global aspects of the whole troublesome mess.

I followed the Senator very closely. I am in agreement with him that we must keep a tight hold on the situation. We must not let it get out of control. I do not believe that we will let it get out of control.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his comments. They are worthy of consideration, particularly, coming from him, a well-informed member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I point out, in response to him, that I, too, have talked with the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and have heard testimony from the Secretary of State and others, and have talked with representatives of the Defense Department. I speak solely for myself. I talked with the Secretary of Defense and with many others over a period of more than a year. Something is being done. I do not say that the administration is indifferent in the slightest to this problem.

However, my point is that more drastic and more urgent and more positive steps are necessary before we can achieve needed results to stop this development. I cannot believe that, with my knowledge of our great striking power, if we were to resist it, we would touch off some trouble in Berlin. I do not believe that Khrushchev would risk war with us over Cuba or over Berlin. Certainly we cannot let one buildup follow another, in Cuba, or Berlin, or Formosa. If we do, we will be nibbled away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe the Senator meant to leave that impression.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not mean to do that at all. When I started I said that it seems to me that people sometimes thought of this as an isolated incident. We must work at the whole global job, and work hard. In that connection I wonder if the Senator has read a column—

Mr. STENNIS. Before the Senator leaves that point, I believe I should say that if we take positive action to protect ourselves in the Cuban area we will be furnishing to the world conclusive proof that we will take steps to protect ourselves in other areas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. We are taking that action. We are doing it, in the words of the Senator, "in due course." I wonder whether the Senator has read a column written by Walter Lippmann, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It is found on page 21648 of the RECORD. I recommend its reading. It is a very thoughtful article dealing with this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I shall read it. I have read many articles along this line, pro and con, but I have not read the article to which the Senator has referred.

I conclude by saying, with emphasis, that I hope the Senator from Alabama is correct in his expression as to what he called the strong probability of unity of action. Lack of unity of action is one of the things that disturbs the Senator from Mississippi. That is what has disturbed the Senator from Mississippi, as he has watched these developments week after week, month after month, and year after year. My proposed step would bring about unity of action in Latin American countries. It would bring about unanimity of action with respect to our allies elsewhere. This step or a similar step will be proof to the world and to our allies in particular that we will move in on this situation and do what is necessary, not precipitately, but in due course and in due time; and that does not mean at some remote time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have read an article printed in a New York paper, to the effect that Mr. Donovan, who is acting as the go-between in the negotiations for the release of the Cuban prisoners, is acting as an agent of the U.S. Government in those negotiations, and that a substantial part of the ransom money is being put up by our Government. I cannot conceive of that being true. However, I notice that the story goes on to state that no official in the executive department has thus far denied it. I was wondering whether the Senator from Mississippi had any information on that subject and, if so, whether he wishes to say anything about it.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is a member of the Appropria-

tions Committee. Nothing like that has come before him in any hearings, and he has had no information with regard to it. I heard the subject mentioned on the radio, as a possibility. However, I have not been able to follow it up, because I have been busy with other matters, and have not had the opportunity to check on the radio report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope it is an erroneous report.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope so, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I trust it is an error and that our Government is not putting up a part of the ransom money. However, I feel that our Government has a responsibility to issue a denial of the statement, before it goes any further.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi agrees. I would be very impatient with any proposal for our Government to pay a part of the ransom money out of the National Treasury. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I close by emphasizing again that we hear a great deal of talk about what Russia is going to do with reference to Cuba. We know that one thing is certain, and that is that she will keep building up one thing after another so long as her hand is not called, and so long as there is no effective contest with respect to it. She will do that until some effective moves are made by us. It might not be necessary to do more than to start them. When those moves are made her efforts will be cut off and destroyed, whether it be in Berlin, Formosa, or elsewhere. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi it is much more likely that a great deal of the steam will be taken out of her efforts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOBBYING POWER OPERATES UNCHECKED IN WASHINGTON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most unfortunate, and neglected aspects of Government in Washington is the activity of lobbying and lobbyists. There is no question that lobbyists are very effective indeed, and there is no question that efforts looking toward their regulation are so ineffectual that they have become a farce.

An excellent series of articles is now being written by James McCartney, of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Daily News, an outstanding reporter. Before I ask unanimous consent to have the series of articles placed in the RECORD, I wish to quote briefly from some of the statements made by Mr. McCartney:

The 16-year-old regulation of Lobbying Act is little or no help. Under it many lobbyists, including some of the best known, such as the National Association of Manufacturers or Americans for Democratic Action, don't even bother to register.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21865

Additional proposed legislation.

4. Sources of information will include:
National management association source materials as made available.

Journals and magazines.
Newspaper reports and news items.
Published and unpublished theses.
Books.

Court decisions and records.
Decisions and reports of relevant government boards and commissions.
Arbitration awards.

Congressional and State legislative reports and evaluations as made available.

Personal interviewing and programing.
5. Materials collected may be useful to parties interested in action programs related to answering the abuse of union power. Such materials are also expected to become a rich source of materials for writing in the field. The research program itself is not intended to produce specific books, monographs or articles; yet the writer, and others making use of information secured, can be expected to prepare materials for publication on the strength of such information.

6. In process of such collection and evaluation of material, it is expected that there will be developed a comprehensive and detailed topical outline; in time and as the project so requires, information retrieval devices for quick access to information in the specific areas; an evaluation of information sources; and a method for continuing acquisition, collation, evaluation, and reporting of up-to-date information.

7. It is expected that the program will, during this year, produce in comprehensiveness, depth and detail, information sources substantially superior in content, methods of evaluation, availability, and outline analysis, to anything which has been attempted to date; and all that is produced during the current year becomes a base upon which to build for information retrieval and reporting in the years ahead.

To accomplish the foregoing, a supplemental budget allowance is required, commencing immediately and extending to the end of the calendar year.

An approach of this nature is indispensable to the ultimate success of any program that may be designed to reach a realistic solution to the problem. Absent the foregoing, it will be necessary for the business community to continue to rely upon the preachment of platitudes. There does not now exist satisfactory capacity to support those legislators who have introduced bills to correct the abuses of organized labor.

Labor organizations have set aside, through their vast research divisions, sums in the high six figures to prevent inroads upon their monopoly position. This, of course, does not include the \$2,500,000 currently being expended by unions for short courses on college campuses during the summer months of 1962, nor funds used for political purposes.

It should be recognized that this is a continuing program and will require further, but lesser, resources over a period of several years. In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the industrial relations division, through its annual institutes, has made available a fund of \$25,000 net, and has produced during the past 18 months approximately \$60,000 gross, from industrial relations clinics conducted by its vice president. The expense of this latter program is minimal and is in any event more than offset by increased revenue from renewal, increase, and new membership.

All of the several programs which the industrial relations division provides for the field are on a self-sustaining basis. The literature which it distributes has returned many times its cost through minimal charges that are made. Furthermore, it will not be overlooked that much of the amount re-

quested for this budget has been saved this year through a streamlining of the staff. The contemplated replacements should not increase the revised budgetary limitations.

RANSOM FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I feel compelled to rise today even at this late hour to raise my voice in objection, which I did yesterday and have done before for nearly 2 years now, to the abortive proposal of the tractors-for-prisoners deal and now the \$62 million Cuban prisoner deal in the name of ransom because it is nothing more and no less than blackmail. The insulting proposals of Fidel Castro and his constant demands, extravagant demands, which he has repeated again just the other day, demanding \$62 million—now \$60 million—\$2 million has been paid, this \$62 million demand made by him in the name of indemnity for repayment for damages done in the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs.

I introduced a resolution in 1961 which stated very clearly by position in opposition to the tractors-for-prisoners abortive proposal. Finally, the administration itself withdrew its support on that particular proposition. Shortly thereafter, however, a new proposal was made in early 1962. This was not for tractors. This was not for \$25 million worth of tractors as indemnity and ransom and blackmail. This was for \$62 million—dollars—spendable American dollars was demanded. I brought out on the floor of the House, and it is in the Record, that earlier, this demand being made in 1962, that earlier even before the demand was made, the administration had been giving consideration to and had issued an order, a preliminary regulation of the Internal Revenue Service, on December 6, 1961, to the effect that contributions to the Cuban Family Committee would be tax deductible. Now this was as far back as 1961, December, even before Fidel Castro made his money demand, changing it from tractors to money. And during a period after it was publicly announced by the President that the United States was withdrawing any support of the tractor deal.

There is not any question but what the administration has directly or indirectly been working hand in hand with Fidel Castro in an effort to get the prisoners released by negotiating for the paying of ransom of some sort, and it appears obvious as an effort to apologize for the mistakes made by the administration in the invasion of the Bay of Pigs. This was probably the most serious mistake and one of the blackest blotches in the history of this country, the refusal and failure of the President of the United States to provide air cover in order that the invasion could be successful.

Now in an effort to bail out the administration because of the mistake,

there is this second abortive proposal, and now for the first time in the history of this country ransom is being negotiated to be paid to an enemy government. For the first time in the history of this country a ransom and indemnity is being negotiated with Fidel Castro, which the Nation has already stated through this legislative body as being the head of an enemy government, a Communist government, in the Cuban resolution passed by the House recently.

The administration is still negotiating the payment of indemnity to that enemy Communist government. How silly we must look. How silly we must look in the eyes of the people of the free world, let alone how weak and vacillating to the Communist governments. How silly we must look in the eyes of all the world in condoning these ransom negotiations when this body passed a resolution of recent date—Public Law 87-733—demanding strong action on the part of the administration, saying we will back the President in any efforts necessary, that the United States is "determined"—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

Approved October 3, 1962.

Are we working toward the realization of the aspirations of freedom-loving Cubans, for the Cuban people themselves to achieve their self-determination when what we do is to make available to Fidel Castro badly needed, according to the latest press releases, foodstuffs, paid for by American taxpayers, foodstuffs to Fidel Castro which he needs as badly as he needs military materiel, and perhaps even worse? It is common knowledge that his efforts in agrarian reform and providing agricultural products for his people are a dismal failure. And so we are bailing him out of his failure, and at the same time compounding the failure of the administration in the Bay of Pigs invasion by paying indemnity.

This House has spoken further in the Mutual Security Act, and in no uncertain terms. How foolish we must look, Madam Speaker, in the eyes of other freedom-loving nations that we are asking to refrain from trading with Cuba, not only military materiel but all trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act—I have it before me now—to the effect that—

None of the funds provided in this bill shall be available for assistance to any country the government of which sells arms, munitions, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes any sort of aid, either military or economic, to the regime.

We also provided for the cutting off of funds to any country that trades with Castro, and with the Communists in Cuba or in this hemisphere.

This Government has spoken through Congress twice in unequivocal terms.

In the last consideration of the question of money or dollars for Castro I introduced a resolution in strong opposition to it, House Concurrent Resolution 459, on April 11, 1962. This was after I discovered that the Internal Revenue Service had already issued a preliminary order on December 6, 1961, that was then in effect based upon which contributions to this Cuban Family Committee were tax deductible.

I introduce an amendment to the mutual security bill which barely failed, which would have put this ransom proposal in its proper resting place—the ash can. It barely failed by a vote of 134 to 137, and it barely failed not because of a single Member on the Republican side voting against it. I was amazed at the offer by Mr. Donovan of ransom for the Cuban prisoners in the amount of \$60 million or for foodstuffs which can be interpreted only as an indemnification by this Nation for the overt acts of this Nation. This was through a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. This is a way of playing a little politics at the same time.

This country through its overt acts is consenting to paying or having paid an indemnity to a Communist country—Cuba.

That is blackmail, that is extortion.

This demand for ransom is reminiscent of the days of piracy on the high seas, and repugnant to every principle of decency and self-respect.

This Nation by considering this proposal and authorizing Mr. Donovan to negotiate it is kowtowing to the demands of a Communist dictator, resulting from an imprisonment order handed down through a kangaroo court which resulted in the imprisonment, thus giving recognition to the court itself—an indirect recognition of Castro's Communist government. How can we say we do not recognize Castro on the one hand, and on the other hand recognize and negotiate with Castro through Donovan? This Nation's prestige is sinking in the eyes of the world, and as of this time this giving in to Castro's indemnity and ransom demands can only be interpreted as yielding to and being soft on and conciliatory toward the Communists and communism.

This is the thing I cannot understand. There are thousands more prisoners rotting in Castro's rathole prisons who could be traded and could be made the basis of further demands for further indemnifications from this country or its citizens. Where is the end of it? There are 100,000 of them, it is estimated, in Cuban prisons.

As a matter of fact, as I brought out earlier in the day, based upon a letter received by me from the Department of State dealing with the question, which replied to my inquiry of the State Department as to why they will not recognize the free and non-Communist government in exile to help them win back their own freedom. I could hardly believe the answer I got. But in that answer, in which the excuse was if we did

so—recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile—we would not be able to continue, in effect, to do business with Castro through the Swiss Embassy, go on to say—this is from the letter of March 12, 1962, signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

U.S. citizens are in prison. Where is the compassion for the U.S. citizens that are in prison equal to the compassion being shown by the administration through Mr. Donovan with regard to the Cuban exiles in prison?

No one has more sympathy for them than I—the Cuban prisoners—but everyone in Cuba is a prisoner today. The whole population—millions of them are prisoners. There are also Americans who are prisoners. There are a hundred thousand who are actually incarcerated.

Thousands of Americans lost their lives in the two World Wars and in Korea fighting to uphold the dignity of America and trying to affirm their dedication to freedom. Can we do less here today? Can we compromise away to Castro the causes for which they fought and died?

These are some of the questions and I want to get an answer to them. What right does a private citizen, in view of the Logan Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act have in doing business with Fidel Castro after it is stated that this Government finds the Castro Communist regime to be an enemy of this country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is certainly a very great difference between the proposals as we have them by rumor and the so-called tractors-for-freedom matter. As I remember, the tractors-for-freedom deal, with which neither the gentleman from Florida nor I agreed, they were to be bought with money collected by private citizens. However, if we can believe the reports which we have had today over the wires, which reports certainly have not been denied by the White House, there is every reason to think there will be taxpayers' money used to pay the ransom for the prisoners of the Bay of Pigs under this particular proposal.

If this is true and if we are actually going to pay from this Government to another government—to a dictator, if you will—for the release of prisoners, there will never be another American released by a dictator or by an enemy for free, will there?

I think the answer is obviously "No." We are starting on a course of action here which will rise to haunt us in the future and which will cause every American, wherever he may be throughout the world, to be in danger of being kidnapped and captured and held for ransom. Once you allow yourself to be stamped

with that stamp which says you are a sucker for and weak enough to give in to ransom, then you will never get through paying until you rise up on your hind legs and solve the problem by physical force.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the question of ransom is not necessarily, in my opinion, whether the ransom is raised through a citizens' committee in the form of American dollars or whether it is a request for funds from the United States. Although I agree there is a differentiation as far as the taxpayers are concerned, because the people should be even more opposed and disturbed over any thought of using the taxpayer's money, their money, whether it be direct or not for payment of ransom to Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I read that there is even some possibility that U.S. cash may be involved, according to the news.

Mr. Speaker, I just read that according to the United Press "there were reports that the Kennedy administration itself was prepared to help finance part of the ransom, but State Department and White House officials declined comment on any aspect of the private negotiations."

Mr. Speaker, I thus also see by the press that this is a cloak-and-dagger operation. This is a very supersecret job. This is one of Bobby Kennedy's quickies—under the philosophy of do-it before the people realize what is happening and the shock of realizing it has been done will not be quite so great—politically that is.

Mr. Speaker, I quote further from the UPI release today:

Evidence mounted today that Government officials are playing a behind-the-scenes role in negotiations for the release of 1,113 prisoners in Cuba. Whatever the role may be, it was cloaked in official silence.

Mr. Speaker, is it not the American people's right to know what deal is being cooked up with possibly their money and wealth in the form of foodstuff surpluses or otherwise which is involved in these negotiations?

Mr. Speaker, I quote further:

But there was this evidence to link the Government with efforts, ostensibly initiated by relatives of the prisoners, to free them:

A report that James B. Donovan, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator from New York and attorney official representing the families of the prisoners, actually was assigned to the negotiator's role last June by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Kennedy said the report—published by the New York World-Telegram and Sun—is untrue, but it was known that Donovan visited the Attorney General several times in recent months.

The American people have been denied any knowledge of these super-secret negotiations on this vital matter, and I ask why?

Permit me to say parenthetically that it was reported in the press just the other day, before his most recent visit, that he visited the Attorney General's office before he went down to Havana to continue negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, quoting further the UPI report today:

1962

A Justice spokesman declined to comment on the subject that the prisoner negotiations were discussed during these visits.

On at least one of the visits, Donovan was accompanied by a State Department specialist on Cuban affairs.

Does that not speak for itself? And further quoting:

Some Members of Congress informed on progress of the negotiations indicated that they expect Government funds to be used for part of the cost of effecting the liberation of the prisoners.

I am one of them. I have asked the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to advise me as to whether it is true or not, because all of the press releases indicate it is and I have condemned it. Under what statute and under what law, and what authority is this done, particularly in view of the strong action taken by this body recently, expecting that trade would be cut off and that any aid to Castro would be cut off? We see now that while the administration talks rough, when it comes to action it looks like it uses a powder puff. Talk tough and use a powderpuff—in dealing with the Communists seems to be the rule of the New Frontier.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue on the floor of this House, this issue of secret negotiations by a U.S. citizen, a private citizen, Mr. Donovan, with the Castro-Communist Government of Cuba, looking toward the payment of \$60 million of ransom.

I subscribe completely to the gentleman's protest and associate myself in asking for an answer to the questions as to the authority for such negotiations. I oppose any payment of ransom by anyone of any kind through the connivance of our Government, to anyone in Communist Cuba. And secondly, and just as important, I want to join the gentleman's protest to the withholding of facts and information from the American people.

It would be reprehensible it seems to me to keep such negotiations secret until they were an accomplished fact and it was too late for public indignation or congressional action, or anything else, to stop them. As a matter of fact, any such devious plan might so outrage public opinion, it seems to me, that it could well invite a congressional impeachment proceeding.

Madam Speaker, the Secretary of State should make immediately available to the press and to the public a full explanation of what is going on. Certainly no dealings could have been conducted without the aid and support of the Government. And I might say that it is an odd thing—the gentleman mentioned the Attorney General; the situation legally is such that any prosecution under the Logan Act would have to be by the Attorney General. And, indeed, only the President could pardon anyone who breached the law. So this, it seems to

me, is a matter between, you might say, the Kennedy family and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I compliment the gentleman. He has done the right thing in asking that all the facts be given to the American people.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and to comment further; one of the things that is so disturbing to me is this. While these negotiations are going on to pay Castro \$60 million in one form or another to help support his Communist regime—and that is the obvious result of it, it helps to keep him in power—at the very time these negotiations are going on, and inadvertently Mr. Donovan is campaigning for the Senate in New York down in Havana—we find Mr. Dorticos, the President of Cuba, calling upon the United Nations to condemn the United States, with resulting riots around the United Nations evidencing U.S.-citizen distaste for Castro and communism in Cuba. So we find these negotiations for ransom continuing and we find that even while Mr. Donovan is in Havana, Castro, himself, is proclaiming again, "I am a true Communist; I believe in communism." He is telling it to the world again, so there can be no doubt about it, he is a Communist, his country under his rule is Communist, and at the same time the United States is hoping and planning to pay him \$60 million for ransom of some prisoners through Mr. Donovan—which he will use to continue to keep all of Cuba a prison.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, today I sent a telegram to the President of the United States on this general subject. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The apparent involvement of your administration with the rumored \$62 million ransom deal with Castro is disturbing. As an American citizen it disturbs me because if the rumors are correct, it is further evidence of the extent to which we have departed from the principles expressed by one of our prominent forefathers who was willing to provide "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." As a Member of the Congress, I am disturbed because this would be further admission on the part of your administration of its involvement in the Bay of Pigs tragedy. As a Senator, you were critical of the admission by President Eisenhower of our involvement in the U-2 incident. Yet that involvement certainly did not weaken our international prestige to the extent that your self-proclaimed failure in the Cuban invasion would do.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am disturbed at the thought that in spite of the sentiments expressed and the

safeguards adopted in both the authorizing legislation and the appropriations bill for foreign aid, funds appropriated for foreign aid may be used for the purpose of paying ransom to a Red dictator.

I respectfully request that your administration divulge the extent to which it is involved in the negotiations of one James B. Donovan, a Democratic candidate for the Senate from the State of New York, for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners. Specifically, I would like to have the amount of money which has been or will be committed to this purpose from foreign aid appropriations, and the categories of aid from which such commitments have been or will be made.

J. J. R.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that under the Logan Act the negotiations of Mr. Donovan probably are not legal; in fact, as a lawyer, having read the act, I would say they probably are not legal. If this is the situation, the only thing the Attorney General of the United States could have promised, if indeed he promised Mr. Donovan anything, is immunity from prosecution?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I just happen to have a copy of the Logan Act before me which I placed in the Record in the discussion on the tractor deal, and the \$62 million deal previously. Here it is:

Title 18, United States Code, section 953: Private correspondence with foreign governments:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, it follows that Mr. Donovan could not have been an agent of the U.S. Government for this purpose because the Attorney General could not have appointed him to carry on negotiations with a foreign government. Does it not follow that the only thing that Mr. Donovan could have received was the assurance of the Attorney General that under this administration, at least, he would not be prosecuted for the violation of the laws of the United States?

Mr. CRAMER. If his dealing had been with the Attorney General, under the language of the Logan Act it is my opinion that the Attorney General does not have power to give "the authority of the United States," and therefore if he is not able to give the authority to negotiate, which he obviously cannot do as Attorney General, that would have to come from the President or from the Secretary of State. Then the other thing that could be promised is what the gentleman is suggesting, and that is immunity

from prosecution, because the Attorney General or one of the family clan or family dynasty would be the one that would have to bring the prosecution. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I think this is a matter, because it has come up now two or three times in recent years under this administration, that should get, and should get immediately, the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because I do not know of a greater invasion of the rights of this body or the rights of Congress, the Senate in particular, that could be involved than to have a private person negotiating with a foreign government without the Senate of the United States, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, having a right to look at the agreement entered into through the constitutional process of ratification.

I think that is an invasion of the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, let alone it is an invasion of the proper functions of the executive branch of the Government, the President, and the executive having the sole authority to do business with foreign governments. I know of no leaders in Congress who have—in the usual tradition—been kept advised of negotiations with this enemy government. Is not even the Congress, entitled to know?

I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at least, ought to look into this entire matter. It ought to call Mr. Donovan before it and ought to find out exactly what this deal is and how much it is going to cost the American taxpayer, and consider the serious questions involved that I have raised.

I was coming up here on a plane just the other day, and I read my hometown paper. Interestingly enough, it did not appear in the Washington Post. I read the St. Petersburg Times of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, when Mr. Dorticos was taking off on us, condemning the United States. Here was the Associated Press release from Havana carried in that newspaper, again I say not in the Washington Post:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

The article was referring to the ransom for the prisoners.

The ransom for the prisoners reportedly will consist of \$60 million worth of food and medicine which will be taken to Cuba in Cuban ships. Castro originally had demanded \$62 million for release of the prisoners.

Again:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

Further, from the press or otherwise my source of information because I have not gotten a reply to my wire asking that this matter be brought to public attention and asking what authority exists for such action. It clearly appears that the U.S. Government is being put by this administration in the wholly untenable position, I might say unholy position, of negotiating with Fidel Castro for the relief of these prisoners in the amount of \$60 million worth of money or foodstuffs, and it is being done in direct contravention of the statement made to the Congress of the United States in very recent months. It makes our policy in regard to non-shipments to Cuba look just as foolish as it could be. It makes our foreign policy about as two-faced as it could be. I, for one, do not understand it, and feel it is my duty to protest it. Apparently, this administration has the attitude when it comes to prisoner ransom and release: American prisoners, no; Cuban prisoners, si. That is apparently the policy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Communism has been a failure throughout the world. But of all the areas in which it has failed, it has failed most dismally in the area of providing food for its own people.

Mr. CRAMER. Right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It seems we are now in the process of giving food to Poland and giving food to Yugoslavia and now food to Cuba, and that apparently we are trying desperately to make up for the shortcomings of the Communist world. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for bringing this to the attention of the House and to the attention of the American people. This is certainly a situation which, if the rumors are correct, deserves to be corrected and deserves to be investigated by the appropriate bodies of this House.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman and may I ask the gentleman, does he know of any excuse why the administration would keep this super-secret and not make the negotiations public?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do not, particularly when I remember how, during the previous administration, many people who are prominent in this administration were talking so much about the right to know, about freedom of information. I believe in the right to know on the part of the American people, and I hope the administration will begin to practice the extension of this right to know as so many of those people were preaching during the previous administration.

Mr. CRAMER. The New Frontier propagandists have been trying to make it appear that those who oppose this are not interested in the release of these prisoners, are somehow more patriotic than humane. I say categorically now and I said so in a resolution I introduced, I am interested in their release but I am equally interested in the release of all other prisoners with dignity and permanent freedom—without getting down on our knees to Castro—without humiliation. The way to release them is by recognizing a government-in-exile of the refugees and by supporting them. They would win back freedom for all Cubans.

This is not only my view, but when I introduced the resolution, House Concur-

rent Resolution 459, and the previous resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 479, I received a letter from Dr. Elpidio Garcia which I put in the Record. He happens to be a former prosecutor for the Government before the supreme court of Cuba and attorney general, and he joined me in opposing the ransom deal. Here is what he said about it:

A little over a year ago, a group of my fellow citizens, pledging their lives to their duty and their country, devoted themselves to the glorious task of reconquering their freedom and independence. The successful outcome of that valiant effort was prevented by reasons which are known to everybody. We are unable to render any other offering or tribute to the unselfishness and sacrifice of our captive brothers than our grief and self-denial as we see them imprisoned, but we cannot diminish the magnitude of their glory or of their service to the country by buying their freedom—the freedom of the unfortunate hostages in the hands of the wretch who seized them—or of the highwayman who imprisoned them—nor can we offer their hopes for freedom anything else but our unswerving determination to reconquer their freedom, even if it should cost us our lives.

Thank you very much, Mr. CRAMER, for the dignified, reasonable, and courageous bill presented by you to both the House and the Senate, which I have had the good fortune of reading and which preserves the dignity of our prisoners, the honor of our fellow citizens, and the decorum of our brothers. Grateful Cuba will know how to thank you for your noble and honorable initiative. May the Lord grant the Cubans success in the final battle for our freedom, with the aid, cooperation, and stimulus of our invincible brothers, the Americans.

That is what even the Cubans feel about this abortive ransom deal. Let us hope the New Frontier does not make the United States party to another Cuban debacle as seems to be planned and underway. God help America if we continue to compromise our honor, our dignity, and dissipate our moral strength in this fight against atheistic communism as we have been doing in Cuba and are apparently bent on doing again.

I include my wire and ask for some answers:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding \$60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the \$62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for an authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro, and hav-

1962

ing introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the \$62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States, through a private citizen, and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business with Castro, and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the \$60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of \$60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world of the future. I am asking that this super-secret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen, namely Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the in-shipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. The basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated, in my opinion, in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
2. How much in U.S. owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

BONNEVILLE ELECTRIC POWER IN IDAHO MEANS INDUSTRIAL GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. Pross) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Madam Speaker, for years the people of my State of Idaho have been seeking ways to expand opportunities for our businessmen, to spur our industrial growth, to create a stronger economy, and to widen the horizons of our children.

I am sincerely convinced, Madam Speaker, that if Idaho is to continue to move forward, and to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, we must bring low-cost electric power from the Federal Bonneville Dam into our State.

Two moves are in the making to do this. First, the Federal Government is considering action which will assure Idaho its fair share of Northwest public power, and second, the Congress has before it legislation to retain for the Northwest, first call on Northwest power. I am sponsoring both moves.

Now, there are those who say: "Let's keep low-cost Federal power out of Idaho."

I say: "Let's get our share."

Who is really fighting for the people of the State? I contend I am, and here in my hand is the proof.

These are Idaho Power Co. bills rendered within the last year to the citizens of Idaho. This bill is for \$11.50 for 800 kilowatt hours. In Milton-Freewater, just across the State line in Oregon, the charge for the same service—the same number of kilowatt hours—is \$7.63 percent more in Idaho than in Oregon.

Here is another one. It is for 1270 kilowatt hours. The cost in Idaho was \$18.88. It would have been only \$9.35 in Milton-Freewater, 102 percent more in Idaho.

Here are some other bills. This one is 62 percent higher, this one 65 percent, and this one 105 percent higher.

Kilowatt-hours	Idaho power cost	BPA cost through public utilities	Percent higher	Higher
730.....	\$10.87	\$6.65	62	\$4.25
800.....	11.50	7.00	65	4.50
880.....	12.31	7.45	65	4.86
1,270.....	18.88	9.35	102	9.53
1,310.....	19.58	9.55	105	10.03

Why are these costs so much higher in Idaho than Oregon? Because Oregon has Bonneville Power, and in the area in which these bills were rendered, Idaho does not.

Let us look at some examples of what it costs to run a business in Idaho.

Westvaco Corp. of Pocatello paid the Idaho Power Co. \$3,110,500 for electricity in 1960. With BPA power they would

have saved \$1,380,000. How many jobs does that add up to?

In 1961, Monsanto Chemical Corp. paid \$2,807,799 to the Utah Power & Light Co., while Central Farmers paid this same company \$1,405,394. This is a total of almost \$7½ million.

If these three big phosphate companies had been served directly by Bonneville, they would have saved more than half of their power costs, or nearly \$4 million in 1 year.

Think what this much money could do to offset the high freight rates which plague the West, and how much more competitive it could make Idaho phosphates in a bigger marketing area—not to mention cheaper fertilizer for Idaho's own farmers. Convert that amount into plant facilities and monthly paychecks.

With lower Bonneville power rates Idaho phosphate companies could increase their production fourfold by 1980, create 3,000 new jobs in their plants and 6,000 new jobs in supporting industries and businesses. More out-of-State dollars would come into Idaho to help pay Idaho wages and Idaho taxes. Without low-cost power officials of these companies have made it clear that not only can there be no expansion in Idaho, but they may have to move their operations to another State.

I also say "let's get our share," because we are entitled to it.

Maybe you cannot tell by the color of the water, but that's Idaho water generating electricity at the Lower Snake and Columbia River Dams. Waters rising in Idaho produce almost 27 percent of the power at Ice Harbor, McNary, the Dalles and Bonneville Dams, and at John Day when it is completed.

This amounts to nearly 6 billion kilowatt hours per year. Six billion not million—"B" as in bread and butter. Yet, only 207 million kilowatt hours comes into Idaho, and that only in a few northern counties. And remember we are not talking about power that will be generated some time in the future, we are talking about power that is being generated today—this very minute.

Idaho water produces for others 33 times as much low-cost Federal power as Idaho now gets from BPA; 12 times as much as the Bureau of Reclamation produces in Idaho for Idaho.

Why are we not getting our share, and at rates homeowners and industries elsewhere in the Northwest are getting Federal power? Somebody is selling Idaho down the river.

What is worse we are being sold out by Idahoans—Idahoans who raise the phony arguments of "danger to our water rights," "unfair competition," and "who is going to pay the taxes?"

Idaho water rights will not be impaired by bringing Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho. Bonneville does not run the dams—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers do that. Bonneville just sells the power. Here in Idaho, the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to make water releases in accordance with State laws. It is a well-established policy of the Bureau and the Corps of En-

gineers that irrigation rights come first, and power production must be consistent with such use.

Not once since the beginning has anybody in the Columbia Basin complained that the Bureau's operation of Grand Coulee Dam for the Bonneville Power system has kept needed water from the land.

Bonneville will provide competition for our private utilities, all right, but hardly "unfair competition." Just look at what has happened to the private utilities in Washington and Oregon who face Bonneville competition. Their rates are down, and their sales and profits and stock market values are up. They have learned how to make more money by selling more power at less cost. And none of them is applying for a 13-percent rate increase. They are selling residential power for less today than they did in 1938. Idaho Power Co. is not. But their profits are just as big at Idaho Power's. They have gained, and their customers have gained.

Taxes? As their sales and profits have gone up, so have the taxes of these private utilities outside Idaho. The same will be true of Idaho Power Co. when the competition of low-cost Federal power forces it to lower rates and increase sales. Idaho will not lose any taxes from Idaho Power Co., but will get more. Even more important, low-cost Federal power will create new taxable wealth, spread the tax burden, and keep your own taxes lower than they otherwise would be.

Low-cost power brings industrial growth that makes new payrolls and profits to be taxed. The industries attracted to Oregon and Washington and western Montana by low-cost Bonneville power generally are the biggest single taxpayers in their respective counties. Low-cost power creates the wealth that pays the taxes.

Now, as I have said, Madam Speaker, if we are going to get our share, two things must be done. First, we must get the Bonneville Power Administration's service area extended to include all of Idaho. Senator CHURCH, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman HARDING, and I have asked that this be done. Secretary Udall, who has the authority to extend BPA service into all of Idaho, has directed BPA to make a feasibility study in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. That study is now well underway, and we hope it will be favorable. If it is favorable, and if the people of Idaho indicate they want Bonneville service, the Secretary will issue the necessary marketing order.

Second, the House of Representatives must pass my regional preference bill which assures the Northwest of first call on all Federal power produced in the Northwest. The Senate has already passed a companion measure. At present, any power in excess of the needs of the Northwest could be sold elsewhere. Right now Bonneville's marketing area includes all of Washington, most of Oregon, western Montana, and the panhandle of Idaho. All those areas will be protected by this legislation. If southern Idaho is included in the BPA mar-

keting area, the legislation would extend the same protection to southern Idaho.

Advances in technology make this legislation absolutely necessary. Until very recently you could not transmit electric power, economically, more than 400 miles. There was no way for Northwest power to leave the Northwest. But today we can transmit electricity up to 1,000 miles, or even 2,000 miles, economically.

Further, existing law says Bonneville Power Administration shall sell its power anywhere within economic transmission distance, and give preference to public agencies. There are any number of public agencies within transmission distance who would like to have our power. If transmission lines are built, without regional preference legislation to protect us, these agencies could demand Northwest Federal power ahead of our industries, ahead of our private utilities, and on par with our own public utilities—municipalities, REA's, and so on.

Bonneville does not want to sell firm power elsewhere at the expense of Northwest customers. But Bonneville is willing and even anxious to sell its surplus secondary power to other areas. Unlike firm power, which is based on the lowest streamflows of record, secondary power cannot be guaranteed for delivery day in and day out, year in and year out because it is produced during high water periods.

As a result, there is practically no market for this kind of power in the Northwest. But there is a market for it in California as a cheaper substitute for electricity produced in steamplants that burn coal, oil, or gas. When low-cost northwest secondary power is available, these plants can be shut down, and fuel can be saved. When it is not available, these plants can be fired up again and electric service can be continued without interruption. California is willing to take our surplus power on that basis.

Bonneville is faced with the problem of either selling this secondary power wherever it can be sold, in order to help preserve its low rates, or to let it go to waste and raise rates. And rates are very important to us in the Northwest. It is not just an ample power supply, but an ample supply of low-cost power that attracts industries and makes jobs and builds our region.

As you may know, all Bonneville revenues go to the Federal Treasury to repay, with interest, the Federal Government's investment in Northwest power dams. Every year for its first 20 years, Bonneville always was ahead of schedule in repaying the Treasury. Five years ago BPA was, cumulatively, \$78 million ahead of schedule. But 5 straight deficit years have cut BPA's surplus to \$20 million. More annual deficits are threatened unless BPA can sell its secondary power. Ironically, in every deficit year BPA has had more unsold secondary power than the amount of the deficit. This secondary power could mean an extra \$15 million in revenue each year.

The danger is this: if Bonneville builds the lines or otherwise makes arrangements to sell this secondary power in California without regional preference

legislation being enacted first, California public agencies—under existing laws—can demand not only the Northwest's surplus secondary power, but firm power as well—power that is desperately needed here.

This is true whether the transmission lines be Federal or private.

Let us make one more point clear: This pending regional preference legislation does not authorize an intertie. BPA already has authority to sell anywhere within transmission distance. As a matter of fact, 3 years ago BPA was all set to hook up with a California private utility, and would have if the Senate Interior Committee, at the insistence of Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON and CHURCH, had not stopped them. These and other northwest Senators demanded that regional preference legislation be passed first, so the people of the Northwest would continue to have first call on northwest Federal power.

What this really gets down to is a case of protecting one of the Northwest's most valuable resources—its low-cost Federal power—rather than putting it in danger of export to California on a permanent and irrevocable basis. A vote against this legislation is a vote to risk the permanent sale of Northwest resources to other States. A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect our northwest resources and our people. That's why seven of the eight northwest Senators voted for regional preference legislation. I regret that our new Republican Senator from Idaho was the only northwest Senator who did not vote for this measure.

I have been fighting for it in the House of Representatives, along with most northwest Democrats in the House and most if not all the House Republicans from the Northwest.

We must keep BPA rates low. We must retain first call on northwest Federal power. And we must get Bonneville power into all of Idaho. This is the way to build our State. This is the way to make more business opportunities and more jobs for Idaho people—the way to make a future for our children and keep them in Idaho. This is the way to lower our electric bills. This is the way every Idahoan can add \$60, \$90, \$120 a year to his income by savings on his electric bills. This is the way to broaden our tax base.

This is the way the farmer, the homeowner, the worker, the businessman and, yes, even the Idaho Power Co. can profit and prosper in a healthy, vigorous, and growing Idaho economy.

THE 87TH CONGRESS—PROGRESSIVE AND IMPRESSIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. The record of the 2d session of the 87th Congress has indeed been both progressive and impressive. Legislative and administrative action has emerged which means so much to us nationally, internationally—